

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,096	03/15/2004	Takeo Oshiba	47539.34	4058
7590 02/01/2006			EXAMINER	
Cameron Kerrigan			GOODROW, JOHN L	
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Maritime Plaza			1756	
San Francisco, CA 94111			DATE MAIL ED: 02/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/802,096	OSHIBA ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		John L. Goodrow	1756
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASSISM (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		,	
2a) <u>□</u> 3) <u>□</u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	on of Claims		
5) □ 6) ☑ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine.	vn from consideration. r election requirement.	
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 3/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	

## Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/04 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuskima et al [6902856 in view of Swain [6366750, Grune et al [6208821] and Toriyama et al [6889020]. Matsuskima et al teaches an electrophotographic image forming method in which the toner satisfies the ratio (Dv50/Dp50) is from 1.00 to 1.15; ratio (Dv75/Dp75) is from 1.00 to 1.20; and the content ratio of toner having a particle diameter of at most 0.7x(Dp50) is less than or equal to 10 percent by number. These physical ratios provide a toner capable of forming consistent quality images over an extended period of time. Note Col.3 and Col. 4. Salting-out/fusion is taught as the method of forming toner particles note Col. 5 line 25-35 and Col. 15 lines 10-20. The photoconductive photoreceptor can be a drum note Col.17 and the charging process can be a blade or roller. Matsuskima et al fails to teach the photosensitive drum with a noise/vibration reducing insert. Grune teaches such a noise/vibration reducing insert as

Art Unit: 1756

solid filler and the filler material be in amounts as small as 5% (by weight) note Col.4 line 43. Swain also teaches a foam material as a holding insert for a belt or drum note Col. 3 line 65. Toriyama et al teaches a vibration insulating member for a photosensitive drum. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention with a reasonable expectation of success to use the known photosensitive drums that reduce noise or vibrations with the toner having improved image densities in the image forming method of forming a latent image on a cylindrical electrophotographic photoconductor.

## Double Patenting

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type 3. double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending Application No. 10/802452 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim a photoconductor including an insert in the cylindrical drum.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John L. Goodrow whose telephone number is 571-272-1384. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,096

Art Unit: 1756

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F. Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John L Goodrow Primary Examiner Art Unit 1756

\*\*\*